

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 35.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 87.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals
Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and
kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, du-
ties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family,
the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to
God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the
type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law;
our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine prom-
ises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

REVIEW OF THE RESULT OF THE EX-PARTE COUN- CIL ON THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

[Concluded.]

Not against Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans
alone, has this bitter gall of the two leading spirits of the
ex-parte council been expended, though the "metropolitan"
position, and "high place" of these, have indeed rendered
them specially obnoxious, and singled them out as a con-
spicuous mark. There lives not the clergyman in the non-
slaveholding States, so gifted, so venerated, or so popular,
as to have escaped the open or covert opposition of these
same clerical gentlemen, had he but committed the same
offence of denouncing with equal scriptural severity, the
inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, insisting with equal
real and eloquence, on the christian duty of excommunica-
ting of the flagitious man-thieves from the sacred fellow-
ship of the saints. A mere allusion to a single instance of
their editorial tactics will justify this charge, by showing
that it is against the entire class of reformers to which Dr.
Cheever and the Church of the Puritans belong, that their
systematic, and persistent warfare has, all along, been di-
rected—notwithstanding their solicitude to share with them
or to filch from them, not the reproaches, but the honors of
their labors.

Doctors Bacon and Thompson probably, will not deny
that when, in 1856, the late Dr. Taylor of New Haven,
landed the old Whig party by saying; "Whiggery and
abolitionism had no fellowship: they were political adver-
saries; the abolition of slavery never was a doctrine of the
Whig party"—and when, in the same connection, he urged
the support of a certain party that had succeeded the
Whig, on the ground that it was "the only means of giving
abolitionism proper, so profound a burial that it shall dis-
turb no more"—the article was published in their *Independent*,
with high editorial encomiums, and "thanks to God who
had given him grace to make the declaration"—that this
was done by the editors, without any expressions of dissent
from the sentiments above quoted, although they did take
pains, forsooth, to object to the honor done to modern abo-
litionists, by calling them abolitionists proper, and thus
identifying them with honored names of the previous cen-
tury. So that all the honors to be ultimately derived from
"abolitionism" as well as "anti-slavery" are to be monopo-
lized by those who can not, in their own localities, and dur-
ing the struggle, consent to bear the reproach of it, the loss
of salaries, and the desertion of pews.

Whether the controlling editors of *The Independent*, who
figured so conspicuously in the ex-parte council, were really
in harmony with Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puri-
tans, on the "issue between slavery and anti-slavery," our
readers may now judge. Assuming such to have been the

fact, they will also judge, not only whether it was proper,
but whether it would be natural, or is credible, that they
could sit in judgment on the case presented to them by the
minority, without making any inquiry into the connection
of their "grievances" with the controversy concerning "sla-
very and anti-slavery" which everybody, almost, knows to
have existed in the Church of the Puritans.

Whether agreeing or disagreeing with Dr. Cheever and
his supporters on the "issues between slavery and anti-
slavery," it became them, as impartial judges in the case,
and even out of a prudent regard to common decency, to in-
quire into the origin and animus of the "grievances" claim-
ing redress.

We do not know that the council did not thoroughly cat-
echise the minority on the origin of the difficulties. We do
not know that the minority did not give the council full and
adequate information. But if they did, we cannot under-
stand how the council could say that "the difficulties which
have passed under their review, have involved no issue be-
tween slavery and anti-slavery."

We will make the supposition that, in reply to suitable
interrogatories of the council, the following statements or
admissions should have been elicited from the minority,
namely,

1. That seventeen of the more wealthy members of the
church and society, being disaffected by the preaching of
Dr. Cheever on the "issue between slavery and anti-sla-
very," requested him, privately, to resign the pastorate, that
they were still farther displeased, because he declined to
comply with their wishes, but laid the matter before the
church, and that most, or all of them left the church and
society in consequence, previous to Feb. 1859, at which
date, the Result of the council commences its history of the
difficulties.

2. That Mr. Charles Abernethy, (the treatment of whom,
by the majority of the church, constitutes one of the char-
ges acted upon by the council), was Treasurer of the church
in 1858, and up to 1st of April 1859, that on several oc-
casions, during those years, in his intercourse with one from
whom he was receiving pew rent, he talked against Dr.
Cheever's course in preaching against slavery, said that it
would ruin the church, that it could not be sustained with
such preaching, that Dr. C. must stop, or go away: or that
those who agreed with him could go into the Lecture
Room, which would hold all that liked such preaching;
that he (Mr. Abernethy) was no abolitionist, and never had
been one—that this was before, and also after Miss John-
son went to England, and before anything was known, in
the church, of any effort by individuals, to save the church,
by raising money in England.

3. That when, in 1859, the church was declared to be
out of debt, it was so declared on the faith of subscriptions
of the previously disaffected, a part of which has never been
paid—that Mr. Charles Abernethy's subscription of \$250,
March 12, 1859, was refused payment by him, and is not
yet paid.

4. That Mr. Charles Abernethy and others, as early as
Feb. 1859, (when they knew nothing of the efforts of indi-
vidual members to raise money in England,) endeavored to
discourage and embarrass the church, in its general financial
operations.

5. That the meeting to elect new Trustees was held about
1st of April 1860. That the old board of Trustees, who
were then about to be superseded, having a majority in op-
position to Dr. Cheever, a few days before they were to
pass out of office, passed a resolution, authorizing their
President, (Mr. Abernethy) to so endorse the pew deeds,
that no forfeiture of pews should accrue, though the assess-
ments upon them should be unpaid,—thus annulling the
agreement originally inserted in those deeds, which bound

the pew-owners to pay assessments on their pews, for the
support of the gospel, or forfeit the pews—and thus ena-
bling disaffected pew holders to refuse paying their assess-
ments, destroy the income of the church, starve out Dr.
Cheever, and yet hold their pews. That the said Trustees
did not report to the society, this official, yet unauthorized
action of theirs, but an acknowledgment of the fact was
drawn out of them at the annual meeting, when one of their
number, a lawyer, (one of the minority calling the council)
told the society that the thing was done, that the society
could not help it, and must submit to it. That the society
at once passed a vote, repudiating the action of the Trust-
tees, and forbidding the President to make any such en-
dorsements, thus preventing the church and society from
being broken down by the movement.

6. That soon after the Old Board of Trustees learned that
an effort was making in Great Britain to help the Church of
the Puritans sustain Dr. Cheever, a meeting of the Trust-
tees was held, when, after pledging themselves that no pub-
lication should be made of their action, the majority of the
Board passed a vote censuring the "British Aid Mission,"
that this was late in the evening, and, the same night, the
vote of censure was placed in the hands of Rev. J. P.
Thompson D. D., and appeared in *The Independent*, the next
day.

Suppose the Council had asked the minority for a full his-
tory of the difficulties from the beginning, and suppose the
minority had communicated all they knew, would not some
such facts as these have been before the ex-parte Council?
Was there not one member of that Council, and a promi-
nent one, who was cognizant of, at least, some of those facts,
sufficient to have restrained him from representing that the
difficulties in that Church had nothing to do with "the issue
between slavery and anti-slavery?"

In view of such facts, if indeed, (as we are well certified)
they are facts, was the Church of the Puritans in fault, for
suspending such members from their communion? Was it
not rather, their mistake, that they had not excommunica-
ted them, long before, and thus saved themselves from the
evils that their forbearance has occasioned? Would it not
likewise have been well, if, when "scenes of disorder" oc-
curred, in the Church or Society meetings, a few of the
more respectable ring-leaders of "the row" had been lodg-
ed, by the Police, in the watch-house, as was done when an
attempt was made, by kindred, but more manly spirits, to
silence Dr. Cheever's voice, by open violence, at the Cooper
Institute?

[If any one should be horrified at the monstrosity of the
implication that Church members of high social position in
"the high places of the metropolis" could possibly be guilty
of mobocratic disorder at religious meetings wherein "is-
sues" concerning "slavery and anti-slavery" were involved,
and yet find titled ecclesiastics to sympathise with, and vin-
dicate them, we refer them to *The Independent's* account of
the famous meeting of the New-York American Tract So-
ciety, up town, among the upper tens, not many years since.
There was one redeeming feature of that demonstration.
No pretences of fraternity and of solicitude for the cause of
"anti-slavery" were employed.]

To those who have known as we have, for more than a
quarter of a century past, the ecclesiastical arts in common
use, in this country, for putting down honest, earnest abo-
litionism in the Churches, and in the ministry, these proceed-
ings will excite no surprise—no, not even the impudent pre-
tence that "no issue between slavery and anti-slavery was in-
volved" in the difficulties. This, excepting in a few excep-
tional instances, has been the stereotyped phraseology, from
the beginning. In no other way could the religious public
have been persuaded to tolerate such persecutions. We re-
peat it; this latest assault, is but a specimen of scores if not

hundreds that have preceded it, only that the majority of a prominent city Church, instead of obscure individuals and minorities, has been now marked out for the proscription.

We see, in this instance, but a single specimen, though a conspicuous one, of the numerous cases that have preceded it. We regard it but a part of the systematic war carried on, by leading ecclesiastics, against the cause of abolition since 1833. That war, except at an early date, has been carried on, chiefly, by pretended friends of the cause. With more open, manly, and out-spoken enemies we have had comparatively little trouble. It was only under the pretense of being "as much opposed to slavery as any body" that, by false accusations, mobs could be got up against us, giving rise to the current parody upon the Colonization orators—"I am as much of an abolitionist as you are: but if you are as much of an abolitionist as I am, you ought to be mobbed." In proportion as they were laughed out of this folly, their power against abolitionism declined. Attempts to procure state legislation against us, were prosecuted by the same arts, and failed because legislators discovered the cheatery and despised it, knowing that "for envy the chief priests" had conspired against us. Dr. Reuben Crandall, when prosecuted for the crime of abolitionism by Francis S. Key, Esq. the Colonizationist orator, and District Attorney, in Washington City, was saved from condemnation and capital punishment, by the fact, brought out in the trial, by the Council for the accused, that the prosecutor himself had professed opposition to slavery. The Journal of Commerce and N. Y. Observer have given us little trouble since they exchanged their pretended opposition to slavery for open defenses of it. So long as the Whig party could afford to claim that it was "the only true anti-slavery party" it absorbed the anti-slavery vote, and kept its nose above water. When its Southern wing compelled it to abandon that ruse, it declined, and became extinct.

No man living, knows, more scientifically or more practically than does Dr. BACON the indispensable necessity of anti-slavery profession to a successful warfare against abolitionism. The Independent, under his skilful leadership, takes the place once occupied by the N. Y. Observer and Journal of Commerce, and does the work that they have lost the power of doing.

From the citadel of *The Independent*, in this "high place of our national metropolis" he shoots forth his missiles of assault against abolitionism, under the shelter of anti-slavery profession. The knight is not without his devoted *Sancho Panza*. Instead of mistaking a windmill for a giant, he mistakes a giant for a Lilliputian, and expects to silence the artillery of God's word against slaveholders by his ex-parte bulls and paper pop-guns. When the pillars of the Divine throne begin to tremble, then look out for the signs of his success.

How long will men halt between two opinions, trying to find a middle ground between right and wrong? How long deny the sinfulness of slaveholding without proclaiming its innocency and Divine warranty? How long claim for it a seat at the communion table, without claiming for it the protection of Government wherever the national flag floats?

Behold the legitimate fruits of the "neither cold nor hot" school of professed "anti-slavery" in the matured demands of the slaveholders! What Doctors Bacon and Thompson say is *not sinful*; they infer must be *innocent*, and if innocent entitled to protection; for what is a Government good for, that does not protect the innocent?

Admitting the premises, how shall we avoid the conclusion? With the Leonard Baconian philosophy for a starting point, with the Joseph P. Thompsonian dispensatory of moral and political medicine for the body politic, what but rampant pro-slavery rebellion could be the result?

The fact is upon us in sober earnest. It is justified by the very process of reasoning we have described. And how do the teachers of the new philosophy greet their disciples? Why, they denounce them as rebels and join with the populace in demanding that they be put down with fire arms and cold steel. They understand that the rebels and the slaveholders are, for the most part, identical. They know that rebellion is claimed by the Southern Churches and Ministry as the fruit and outgrowth of their religion, and that there is no lack of pious rebel slaveholding chaplains for the rebel army.

How do they treat their "dear Christian brethren of the

South" whose fraternity they have so long cherished, crying out against the uncharitable abolitionists who would exclude them from Christian fellowship?—Why, as "rebels" they would meet them with leaden bullets and gun powder. As "Christian slaveholders," they would, on the first opportunity, invite them to their communion tables, and exchange pulpits with them.

No marvel that they are for withdrawing fellowship from the Church of the Puritans!—With all their other fellowships, Northern and Southern, from New Orleans to Boston, from Dr. Palmer to Dr. Adams, it would be manifestly incongruous in them to do otherwise. We congratulate the "unsuccessful" Church and Pastor "on Union Square," on their deliverance from the pretended fraternity of all such. That mask has, not too soon, been thrown aside.

It strikes us that the enterprize of crushing out the "almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders"—by breaking down Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans with the weight of a general excommunication by the Congregational churches, was precipitated upon Doctors Bacon and Thompson, at a most unfortunate crisis, when the entire loyal portion of the country, is earnestly engaged in a civil war to put down a rebellion against the Government, a rebellion instigated, headed, and carried on, by the leading ministers and main body of Church members of the South, for the avowed purpose of protecting, extending, and perpetuating slavery—a time when the enthusiasm for putting down, by force of arms, the "Christian" slaveholding traitors is so overwhelming as to draw into its wake the most conservative and dignified Doctors of Divinity in the country, including even those who do not make professions of being "anti-slavery"—an enthusiasm that has had to find expression, even in *The Independent* itself, and has almost driven it into an advocacy of a national abolition of slavery, the most ultra form of radical abolition extant, so far as political action is concerned. Is the heresy of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and of excommunicating slaveholders to be visited with excommunication, in a crisis like this?

The culmination of the great national "issue between slavery and anti-slavery" identical with the culmination of the long warfare between Dr. Bacon's type of "anti-slavery" and Dr. Cheever's type of abolition. An unfortunate coincidence for the ex-parte council and its friends! There is a power that takes the wise in their own craftiness and brings the council's of unrighteousness to confusion. The fate of the "slaveholding Christian" rebels will be the disgrace of their teachers and apologists, the downfall of the sophistries that have flattered, deceived and destroyed them.

This foul pro-slavery rebellion is not to be put down by Northern steel, and yet the rebels welcomed, hereafter, to Northern communion tables and Northern pulpits!—Nor—if a distinction is to be drawn, in the enlightened public mind, between the sins of rebellion and of slaveholding, will the latter, the guilty cause and hateful animus of the former, be accounted less heinous than its natural effect—the latter. If the rebellion is to be, in reality, put down, it is to be put down by a people thoroughly convinced, by the process, if not otherwise, of "the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding." The nation and the world are not to be left in the moral darkness of believing in the *innocency of slaveholding*, after witnessing the revelations of its character in this country, both in ecclesiastics and in politics—the church and in state—as manifested in the terrible developments of A.D. 1861. Nor will the attempt to capture the capitol and drive away the President, be accounted, fifty years hence, a more disgraceful or a more wicked procedure than the attempt to drive away Dr. Cheever, and get possession of the church of the Puritans.

The demon of slavery, if driven out, by a bloody war, from the nation, is not to find fellowship in the pulpits and communion tables of the churches—nor are those who have spent their lives in sheltering it there, to escape the condemnation of posterity—much less will they be able to succeed in excommunicating the faithful CHEEVERS of the contest, that they may filch their palms of victory and reap their rewards.

On the other hand, if the war should close without purging out the great national sin, of which the war is both the out-growth and the punishment—if the religion of innocent, pious slaveholding should triumph in the camp, as it had

before triumphed at the communion table, or in the Cabinet as it had before triumphed in ecclesiastical conclaves, if innocent slaveholding, with its sacramental passport, should find Congressional and Presidential protection, and in every State and Territory of the Union, if slaveholding Christianity's type of "Freedom of speech and of the press" should be extended over the whole country, and reign in all the Churches, under the amended Constitution proposed by the last Congress, and endorsed by two Presidents—if all this should be the result of the present struggle, it will come as a triumph over "the almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline that excommunicates slaveholders." It will come as the logical and moral sequence, of Drs. Bacon and Thompson's type of "anti-slavery" as distinguished from, and forever in antagonism with, the "abolitionism" of Wesley, Edwards, Hopkins, and Cheever. The future student of our religious, political and military history, will then know, what reflecting men may see now, that, in the process of such a triumph, the fall of Sumpter, the repulse at Big Bethel, or even, should it occur the capture of the Capital, would be less significant and decisive events than the victory of the ex-parte Council over the church of the Puritans, and with it the intended extinction of radical christian abolitionism in the churches of America. The destinies of a country, like ours, are controlled, for good or for evil, by its prevailing religion.

Note.—In this connection, it may be proper to state that out of the Twenty-eight churches (if we are rightly informed) invited to participate in the ex-parte council of the church of the Puritans, there were only sixteen that accepted the invitation, while twelve declined. Of those declining, were the churches of Rev. Dr. Starrs and of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, of Brooklyn—of Rev. S. S. Johnson of Williamsburgh, (N. Y.) and of Rev. Dr. Joel Hayes, Hartford, Conn.

A LETTER TO THE INDEPENDENT.

[The enclosed communication was refused by *The Independent* on the ground that its Editors are not under obligation to admit replies to their strictures on published documents.]

MESSEURS. EDITORS: The charge of malignity, denunciation, and "all uncharitableness," has been so often made against Abolitionists, and so often disproved, that it seems hardly worth while now to notice the stale slander. It is more than ever unnecessary since one, of whom it was asked, not many years ago, as in confident challenge, "Is Dr. Tyng an Abolitionist?" has lately declared in public that slavery is a crime that ought to be abolished, and that shall be abolished, by the righteous war in which we are now involved, and that he is neither afraid nor ashamed to be called an Abolitionist.

But when a religious paper, with a circulation of tens of thousands, charges upon a Christian Society, as you have done in *The Independent* of June 6th, that "it systematically misrepresents and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and Churches of New England," the interests of truth demand, on behalf of such a Society, that the charge be met. And no less, in my judgment, does common fairness, not to say the honor of professed Christian gentlemen, require that the reply to such a charge be admitted to your columns.

Relying, therefore, upon your sense of propriety and Christian courtesy to publish what I offer in denial of your charge, I proceed to meet it in the briefest manner compatible with thoroughness, intending to use an honest plainness of speech, and in so doing, although of necessity speaking in the first person, it will be my endeavor, not to outstrip the bounds of modesty, and to avoid anything like bitterness or personality. Let me then be understood as addressing you simply as Editors of the Independent, upon matters contained in your editorial columns.

The second Annual Report of the Executive Committee to the Church Anti-Slavery Society—from which you quote with treble notes of exclamation and italic types for a very innocent clause thereof, and with flaunting capitals for the inoffensive conjunction *and*, with which it is joined to the rest of the sentence—was adopted by the Society at its public Business Meeting in Boston, on the day of the late anniversary, May 28th.

This Report, you say, "indicts the Ministry and Churches of New England collectively as faithless to anti-slavery, because unwilling to follow the beck of this particular Society. It says (yours being the italics):

"In the infatuation of the fearful years, a real calamity really viced seen the of New somary upon al bring againe
"In Rhode I try met ions of and the door, and specific v the opp way of a of sym subject their own felt againe
Upon
"The Church
sents and
and Church
the coun
your artic
as an unb
"For a
door in N
recognition
the Church
Church w
documents
orderly, is

1. Now
erately ca
defines jes
variousing
by reason
say) is tes
fully imm
true, viz:
knocked at
out securin
token of sy
The Church
nition for i
tion and c
the practic
Church pro
and from th
with the es
with such a
society itself,
slaveholding
der the ban
Scriptural v

2. In the
prevaricatin
which it us
reader to th
to the advic
been unable
those Church
slavery, and
tian abhorre
It were ol
a score of C
at Boston, i
sessed of "pu
as the moral
in an Ex-Pa
Society in M
lished docum
than the con
the advice of
lean, if any
and unsough
prepared for
But in an
"a bit of dro
whom it is re

"In the year of grace from May 1860, to May 1861, when the infamous slave trade was revived and exercised with a fearful activity and prevalence not known before for forty years, and when the country was passing through a political campaign of which, in the providence of God, the only really vital question or living issue was slavery—we have seen the various Ministerial Associations and Conferences of New England meet, pray, confer and indulge in the customary platitudes, but make no pronouncement whatever upon slavery or the slave trade, nor do anything at all to bring the verdict of Christianity and the Church to bear against either of those foul abominations.

"In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, the Congregational Ministry met in their annual assemblies, and with the aggressions of slavery and the execrable slave trade in full view, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society knocking at their door, and asking friendly recognition and concurrence in its specific work of putting the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery, they gave not the faintest token of sympathy with such a work; nor did they discuss the subject in any way, nor did they propose any method of their own to make the Christianity of the nation effectively felt against the national sin of oppression."

Upon these paragraphs you found the indictment, that "the Church Anti-Slavery Society systematically misrepresented and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and Churches of New England." And the only proof of the count which you offer is in these paragraphs. But your article closes with the following, which many regard as an unbecoming and jesuitical fling:

"For a Society which has knocked at every ecclesiastical door in New England without securing for itself 'friendly recognition' or 'the faintest token of sympathy,' to advise the Churches to give their recognition and fellowship to a Church which a strong anti-slavery council, acting upon documentary evidence, has pronounced delinquent and disorderly, is not less amusing than impertinent."

1. Now, Messrs. Editors, I, in common with others, deliberately call this language jesuitical, and why? Webster defines jesuitical to be designing; cunning; deceitful; prevaricating. The language of yours above quoted (whether by reason of habit you are conscious of it or not I do not say) is designing and cunning, for, in the first place, it artfully insinuates, with an appearance of truth, what is not true, viz.: that, by the Society's own confession, it has knocked at every ecclesiastical door in New England, without securing for itself friendly recognition, or the faintest token of sympathy.

The Church Anti-Slavery Society has never asked recognition for itself, in any instance; but it has asked recognition and concurrence in its specific work of trying to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, from three different State Associations, and from three only; and, in each of those three instances, with the same result, not the faintest token of sympathy with such a work. We do not say sympathy with the Society itself, but sympathy in its great work of rendering slaveholding infamous in the public eye, by putting it under the ban of excommunication by the Church, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery.

2. In the second place, your language is deceitful and prevaricating, for it deceptively quibbles by an assumption which it uses as a fact, and then cunningly misleads the reader to the conclusion that there can be no moral weight to the advice given to the Churches, by a Society which has been unable to secure for itself any acknowledgment by those Churches, in its honest attempt to array them against slavery, and to procure from them an expression of Christian abhorrence of slaveholding.

It were obvious here to remark that the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in the Tremont Temple at Boston, in the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and possessed of "published documentary evidence," is just as great as the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in an Ex-Parte Council at the rooms of the Geographical Society in New York, and possessed of the same "published documentary evidence." And the Churches, not less than the community, will be just as likely to give heed to the advice of the one as of the other; only that they will lean, if anything, to the advice that was spontaneous and unsought, rather than to that which was planned and prepared for.

But in another place you are pleased to call this advice "a bit of drollery which is exquisitely refreshing." To whom it is refreshing we are at a loss to know, for to your-

selves, evidently, so far from being refreshing, this passage in the late proceedings of the Church Anti-Slavery Society is highly annoying.

3. Your language is jesuitical, again, when you say, quoting the opening paragraph of the Report:

"What an aspersion is this upon the fidelity of the Churches and the Ministry!—what an impertinent assumption, that because they have not seen fit to elect this Society as their representative, therefore they 'have not seen it to be their part to coöperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Divine Providence for the overthrow of slavery.'"

That, Messrs. Editors, is not our reasoning or conclusion, but it is your logic and your inference jesuitically palmed upon us. The Report, which so offends you, simply declares that it is to be deeply regretted that the professed Churches of Christ and the ministry thereof should not have seen it to be their part to coöperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Providence, the last year, toward the overthrow of slavery; and that it is also to be regretted that they should not have furnished the Committee of the Church Anti-Slavery Society with the means to have carried on, in the name of the Church, a more effective moral warfare with slavery.

The Report finds no fault with the Churches or the ministry for the reason that they have not seen fit to elect the Church Anti-Slavery Society as their representative. Nor has this Society ever asked to be so elected. But, in reviewing the past year, the Report truly says, that—

"While your Committee have seen much in the movements of Providence and the imperial march of events, to warrant the belief that the end of slavery is near, even at the doors, they have also seen, in the indifference or hostility to our philanthropic object and method evinced by Ministerial Bodies, benevolent Associations, Churches, and religious newspapers, what has all along put them in grave doubt as to whether there was to be a peaceable or violent solution to the problem of American slavery—whether, in other words, Christianity was to get at the hearts of slaveholders, through the fidelity of Churches and ministers, or whether, as Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, has put it, THE SLAVES WERE TO GET AT THE THROATS OF THEIR MASTERS, and take by force the liberty which they know to be their right."

4. This statement is strictly and undeniably true. For what is the philanthropic object and method of the Church Anti-Slavery Society? It is to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery. In other words, it is to argue and enforce what you have stigmatized as "the almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders." With this method of abolishing slavery, by putting slaveholding (through the exclusion of the slaveholder) under the ban of the Churches, "as an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church," none of the General Associations or Conferences of New England Congregationalists, have, during the last year, expressed any sympathy.

The nearest approach to it was made by the New Hampshire General Association, at its session in Claremont. But the resolution there adopted, carefully avoided the committal of that body to the doctrine of non-fellowship with slaveholders on account of slaveholding, and as carefully avoided the issue made in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

5. The soreness repeatedly manifested by *The Independent* towards this Society, and the captious spirit uniformly evinced on your part in speaking of it, are owing, we think, to our having taken and maintained the position that slaveholding, of itself, should be a bar to church fellowship and communion. This is the ground on which we hold that the Christianity of the nation ought to plant itself. But yourselves and not a few other leading minds of the New England Ministry have rejected this as a dogma of uncharitableness, and have accused those who hold it as denunciations and malignant, and as siding with infidels.

In your late article, entitled "Per Se—Per Saltum," which, it may be presumed, is that especially which has led the Boston *Liberator* to say of *The Independent*, "whose moral basis, in every direction, is a slippery one"—in that article you characterize this view as the "sin per se dogma, applied by a narrow school of ethics and a most inconsequential style of logic to certain practical questions of morality." And you very self-complacently add that "minds unskilled in logic have declared slaveholding, undefined, to

be sin per se, making this dogma the text and test of opposition to slavery."

Here, if you mean anything, you mean to say that what you call the sin per se school in this country (we have never favored that designation, nor have we dealt, at all, in Latin scholastics) have all along been reasoning about slaveholding without knowing what they meant. "That ambiguous and evasive term 'slaveholding,' you have said before, 'makes all the mischief.' Now, we deny that the term slaveholding is either ambiguous or evasive, or that we have ever used it in any sense but its true one, or that we have ever attempted to establish any 'new anti-slavery tests and definitions.'"

On the contrary, we assert, with entire confidence, that the ecclesiastical, historical and dictionary meaning of that term slaveholding, together with slave laws and judicial decisions innumerable, and common usage in the English tongue, have long since been agreed in making the term slaveholding to be and to express the holding of human beings as property. And that only is what Abolitionists have meant by it, according to your own virtual confession, in quoting the resolution of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1845, which declares "that by slaveholding this Society understands the holding and treating of human beings as property, and maintains that to hold and treat a human being thus, is universally and always sinful, and ought to be everywhere immediately abandoned."

This is what the sin per se school, as you designate it, the abstract right school, have invariably meant whenever they have used the term; and it is high time that the religious press in our country should have done with verbal legerdemain, puerile disputation, and hypercritical hair-splitting in regard to it.

6. What if apologists for American slavery, of the New York *Observer* type, in the pulpit, the Church, the editorial chair, and in the great Associations of benevolence, have, before now, confused facts and confounded moral distinctions by the prefixes applied to slaveholding? What if, when the subject has been brought up by some honest Abolitionist in Synods, Assemblies, Minister's Meetings, and Boards of Missions, learned brethren have straightway fell to talking about benevolent slaveholding, involuntary slaveholding, legal slaveholding, Christian slaveholding, unselfish slaveholding, innocent slaveholding, sinless slaveholding, and all to shield the slaveholder from having guilt charged home upon him? Yet the fact stands that the real and only meaning of slaveholding, by itself, is the holding of a human being as property, as a thing. That is American slavery; that is what Garrison and Goodell and their eloquent associates have been moving heaven and earth for, the last thirty years; and that is what, in the all-wise providence of God, this country is in arms about, now.

And pleased as you might be, Messrs. Editors of *The Independent*, to have "our per se friends come over upon our side by a single hop," and much as it would suit you to "waive all past controversies of logic," it is not going to be waived, that Abolitionists have been along in the right, and are in the right still, in their principles, their premises, their terms, their logic, their conclusions, their warnings and their prophecies.

And we strongly suspect that what has chiefly troubled you, in the late Report to the Church Anti-slavery Society, pumped up by so despicable an agency in your view as a "donkey engine," is the paragraph near the close which says, with special significance—

"And we have seen, finally, an influential religious paper at the North, that has rendered valuable service beforetime in the moral war with slavery, and that is now dealing its blows heavy and hot at the dying monster—we have seen that paper, in order to save an assumed principle of its ethics, that slavery is not *malum in se*, and to prevent the moral obloquy of mankind, and of the churches from settling down upon slaveholding, and the slaveholder, reduced to the last shift of maintaining that the term *slaveholding* cannot be held as an invariable equivalent for holding human beings as property, and that, therefore, slaveholding is not inherently sinful."

7. You have said a good deal in your way, in disparagement of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, while its defenders have been almost wholly excluded from your columns hitherto, just as the defenders of the Church of the Puritans have been excluded, while, with all the fury of partisans, you have persistently assailed that church,

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1861.

and have done your utmost to defeat the honest mission of its pastor in its behalf in Great Britain.

But the time has come when both the Church Anti-slavery Society and the Church of the Puritans must be heard for themselves in *The Independent*, where they have been, in the judgment of many, misrepresented and maligned. or the ministry and the churches will be apprized of the gross unfairness of your proceedings. To me it is anything but pleasant to say these things. But when, with what many call flippant arrogance, you indict as malignant and impertinent, the "published documents of the Church Anti-slavery Society," which bear the honored christian names of Hon. I. Washburn of Worcester, Hon. Wm. Claflin of Newton, Rev. J. C. Webster of Hopkinton, and Lewis Tappan of New York, it is not for a christian minister in my humble position to keep silent.

I am well aware that I expose myself to your sore displeasure, and to your favorite way of manifesting that displeasure, by ridicule and scorn. But sneering and slander have little of terror to one conscious of rectitude, and impelled by duty. While I make no professions of stronger love for justice, or firmer devotion to principle than other honorable men, yet this I know; let me see or hear a wrong done to any man, and it awakens at once an outcry of indignation in my own soul. Nor can I tamely submit to wrong treatment in the case of a neighbor, or in my own case, without an indignant protest. The wrong itself I can sustain.

"With temper, look to heaven, nor stoop
To think my injurer my foe."

But to oppose oppression is a part of my religion. Nor can I help resisting tyranny and domineering in church or State, in a clique of ministers and editors, a committee of trustees or an ex-parte council, without doing violence or treachery to my own moral nature. In so acting, I know no fear of man, while I boast no courage.

But I should be untrue to the revered maternal example, and lessons of youth and manhood, did I not detest injustice in every shape. For this it is, that the poor man and the slave—the one often, the other always the victim of injustice—have my warmest sympathies and prayers. For this it is that I am an abolitionist, and that I have all ways declared myself such, and have stood by that worthy name when it was purposely used in opprobrium, as a synonym for fanaticism and infidelity.

For this it is that, without asking how it will affect my interests, when I see a desperate effort made to put down a man, a church, or a society, I spring to the defence, and I am ready to answer those that meet me as Flavius Priscus, a Senator of Rome, answered the Emperor Vespasian, when he threatened him with death if he spoke anything in the Senate but what he, the Emperor, would have him speak—"Do what you will, and I will do what I ought."

Alas, that at this solemn season, under the manifest judgment of the Most High God, for our great national sin of oppression, there should not be evinced by editors, ministers, and churches, a clearer knowledge of the time of our visitation. Alas, that we should not all be taking occasion, as one man, from our papers, our pulpits, and our prayer-meetings, quitting all our past antagonisms, to press home upon the suffering nation, its guilt in the matter of slaveholding, and to urge now, by the authority of God, upon the people and the government—not the wretched pretense "that we have no right directly to interfere with the institution of slavery"—but the peremptory duty of the immediate national abolition of the nuisance of slaveholding, and the proclamation of liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof, in the name of the people of the United States, and by command of the only living and true God.

Unless we do this, very soon, I greatly fear that the angle of divine forbearance will have been rounded by us, and that the decree will go forth, not then to be arrested by "many prayers" from an apostate and rotten church: ACTUM EST DE TE—TU PERISTI—It is all over with thee—thou hast perished.

HENRY T. CHEEVER.

Jewett City, Ct., June 11, 1861.

A PREDICTION.—Mr. Calhoun said, ten years ago, in the Senate of the United States, "The war will last between the sections while there is a slave in the South. The conflict will never terminate. The South, I fear, will not see it, until it is too late. They will become more feeble every year, while the North will grow stronger and stronger."

LETTERS on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to Mr. B. WILLIAMS, the Publisher.

LETTERS for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to WILLIAM GOODELL.

ORDERS for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

But in all cases, the business matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor—because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file, by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

All letters for us should be carefully directed to 339 Pearl street, not to 48 Beekman street, nor to Box 1212, (the former address of Wm. Goodell, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the more important now, as the office of our friends, is now moved; and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

FEDERAL AND STATE POWERS—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—ORATION OF EDWARD EVERITT.

Politicians and especially political abolitionists are familiar with such topics as "Consolidation"—"State Sovereignty," "State Rights," "Nullification," and last, not least, "Secession." From the very birth of our Constitution, and before it, there have been two rival theories on the subject of either the actual or of the desirable relation between the State Governments and the National Government, if indeed the co-existence of the two were to have been regarded compatible, at all, for there have been grave doubts on that subject.

First on the question of having any National Constitution of Government, instead of the Old Confederacy of States—Second on the question of framing the Constitution, as discussed in the convention, Third, on the question of adopting the draft submitted by the Convention, Fourth, on the proper construction of the Constitution immediately after it was formed, resulting in the famous Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798. Fifth, on the proceedings of the Hartford Convention, during the British war of 1812, Sixth, on the attempt of South Carolina to nullify the Revenue laws, and now, Seventh, on the attempted secession of most of the slave States, in 1861—on each of these several occasions, the subject of State and Federal (or National) relations, has come up for earnest discussion, and debate.

One remarkable feature of the question has been,—as might have been predicted—that all the Federal Administrations, of all, political parties, and all the Federal Courts, under all those administrations, have uniformly held to the Supremacy of the National over the State authorities, and have stood ready to vindicate and enforce the claim. In this particular, there is nothing of novelty, in the position of the present administration. It stands where all its predecessors have stood. The only peculiarity of the present crisis is that a forcible opposition is now made to the Supremacy of the National Government, involving the country in civil war, just as it would have been involved, under any other President, from Washington to Buchanan, inclusive, if any such forcible opposition had been raised. In all previous cases, the asserters of State Supremacy have stopped short of resorting to arms, unless Shay's rebellion and the Whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania, both of which were soon subdued, be regarded exceptions. They cannot well be so regarded, as no State authority was enlisted in their favor.

In this it is involved, as another remarkable feature of the question, that the State Supremacy theory has been espoused only by minorities, for the time being, and while remaining minorities, all such persons and parties, uniformly changing their theory, for the opposite, the moment they come to be in the majority. We might conceive of such a possible event as that most, or even all of the States might assert the doctrine of State Supremacy, as in opposition to National. As a matter of fact, however, such an event has not yet occurred. In the present controversy it has not. The only seeming exception, that of 1798, is not a real one, but the contrary. For although the political party that, while in the minority, rallied, on the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, came into power with Mr. Jefferson in 1801,

it left its theory outside the Capitol and the President's House, before crossing the threshold of either. No Federal Administration was farther from yielding up Federal Supremacy to State Supremacy than that of Mr. Jefferson. No administration has ever made more extensive strides in the consolidation of Federal power, unless it be that of Andrew Jackson, upon whom the mantle of Jefferson has, by common consent, been admitted to have fallen. And besides, no States except Virginia and Kentucky, previous to 1861, have ever affirmed or even assented to, the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, unless the States represented in the Hartford Convention be claimed to have been exceptions, for a brief period.

It follows, as a third remarkable fact, that a majority of the people of the United States have, in every instance, and at all times, in our history, as a people, insisted upon, and thus far maintained the Supremacy of National over State authority. For illustration,

1. The people insisted on exchanging the Old Confederation of States for a National Government of their own.
2. The people ratified the Constitution which in its Preamble declared itself to be the Constitution of the people.
3. The people have always regarded the National Government to be a Government of the people.
4. The people, in 1812 and 1832 frowned upon the attempts made, or supposed to be made, to override the National Government by State Governments.
5. The people are doing the same thing again now, in 1861. It was in open and notorious contempt of the people of the United States, and, in reality, of the people of the so-called seceding States themselves, that pretended acts of State secession from under the authority of the Federal Government have been passed. Give to the whole people of either or all those States, the real, matter-of-fact liberty and opportunity of voting intelligently, and without constraint, on the subject, and each and all of those States would vote against Secession, now. In saying this, we mean to include all the people, irrespective of hue or condition. With exception of one or two States, we might affirm the same, even omitting the colored people.

As political abolitionists—national abolitionists—looking for a national abolition of slavery, we have found this question of the relative position of State and National Sovereignty, a most important and vital one. It is by State, not National legislation, primarily, that the four millions of the American people are enslaved. From State Legislation there is nothing to be expected, in their favor. Political deliverance, if it comes at all, must come from the Sovereign Nation, not from the "Sovereign States." The slaveholders have always understood this, and have taken their position accordingly. The "State Sovereignty" doctrine is in fact their doctrine, devised for the very object of guarding slavery, and for nothing else. The ratification of the Federal Constitution was opposed in the Virginia Convention on this very ground, and the doctrine has now been reduced to practice by the leading slaveholders, for no reason but to preclude and prevent a National abolition of slavery, which they were sagacious enough to fear, however earnestly it may have been disclaimed. They knew, if others did not, that the Supremacy of a National Government of the people, was incompatible with the security of slavery. So long as the Federal Government could, on the slavery question, be controlled by the State Sovereignty theory, as certainly it never has been on any other subject, and thus subjected to their State Sovereignty, it was made their most efficient tool. But when they saw that theory assailed by national abolitionists, and laid bare to public inspection, and when they witnessed the election of a President not absolutely pledged, at every point, to the Supremacy of slavery, that moment they resolved to dethrone National Supremacy by throwing off and, if possible, overturning the National Government itself. They had the sagacity to perceive that in no other way, could their "peculiar institution" escape ultimate extinction by a Government of the Sovereign people. The fear was neither fictitious nor unfounded.

Last winter's discussions in Congress, and for two or three years previous, bear testimony to the fact that this was their great fear, and that they were driven into secession by it.

As the first blow struck at National Supremacy was struck in defense of slavery, so, in reality, though unintentionally,

News of the Day.

OPENING OF CONGRESS.

Congress met in extra session, on Friday July 4. It is the first session of the new Congress recently elected, and contains many new members.

GALUSHA A. GROW, of Pennsylvania, was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, and EMERSON BRYERIDGE, of Tennessee, Clerk. On taking the Chair, Mr. Grow made an eloquent speech, abjuring compromise, and in favor of an energetic support of the government, and the sentiment was enthusiastically received. One of the most marked passages of the speech was the following:

"No flag alien to the sources of the Mississippi, will ever float permanently over its mouth, till its waters are crimsoned in human gore, and not one foot of American soil can be wrenched from the jurisdiction of the Constitution of the United States, until it is baptized in fire and blood. [Vociferous applause upon the floor and in the galleries, which lasted for many minutes.]

The applause was of course out of order, and its repetition was discountenanced by the Chair.

The "peculiar institution" received a dexterous side thrust, in the following sentence:

All parties, sects and conditions of men, not corrupted by the institutions of human bondage, forgetting bygone rancors or prejudices, blend in one phalanx for the integrity of the Union, and the perpetuity of the republic.

THE SENATE was called to order by the Vice President, Mr. Hamlin.

The following Senators were present:

Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Bingham, Breckinridge, Bright, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Cowan, Dixon, Doohittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, Harris, Howe, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, King, Lane of Indiana, Latham, Morrill, Nesmith, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Saulebury, Sherman, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Thomson, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson.

The President's Message is a lucid, plain, straight forward document. Whether the critics find it deficient in literary execution or not, the common people will understand it, and like it all the better for the absence of artificial structure and embellishments. It treats largely of the history of the four months since the President came into office. It details the story of Fort Sumter, speaks of the forbearance of the government, of the defensive measures employed, of the course of Virginia, of the fallacy of neutrality, of privateering, of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, of the sympathy of foreign powers for the Union, of the patriotism of the people, of the sophistry of the rebel leaders, of the doctrine of secession, of the rebel policy ignoring the people, of the leading object of the Union, of the rebel appeal from the ballot box to the sword, of the absence of authority in public servants, on such an issue, to compromise. It calls for troops and funds to carry on the war.

On this latter topic, the only business submitted to Congress, the President says:

It is now recommended that you give the legal means for making this contest a short and decisive one; that you place at the control of the government, for the work, at least 400,000 men, and \$400,000,000. That number of men is about one tenth of those of proper age within the regions where, apparently, all are willing to engage, and the sum is less than a twenty-third part of the money value owned by the men who seem ready to devote the whole. A debt of six hundred millions of dollars now, is a less sum per head than was the debt of our Revolution, when we came out of that struggle, and the money value in the country, bears even a greater proportion to what it was then, than does the population. Surely each man has as strong a motive now to preserve our liberties, as each had then to establish them.

A right result at this time will be worth more to the world, than ten times the men and ten times the money. The evidence reaching us from the country, leaves no doubt that the material for the work is abundant, and that it needs only the hand of legislation to give it legal sanction, and the hand of the Executive to give it practical shape and efficiency.

From present appearances it seems probable that these proposed measures will be promptly adopted by Congress, without any distracting discussions of compromises, and that the people of the loyal States will, with great practical unanimity, approve their course. We say probably, remembering that there is still a border State element in Congress, and more or less of sympathy with them, on the part of some Northern members. Time will soon decide.

vague theory of originally Sovereign States, previous to United States is exploded in the Message, as a fallacy, to be repudiated as fictitious.

We invite attention to the argument of President Lincoln, and ask that it be preserved and laid up for use, in the future battles of freedom. That doctrine, established in the minds of the people, will soon sweep all the pretended compromises of the Constitution, favoring slavery, to the winds. All those supposed compromises rest on expositions growing out of the false theory that the Constitution describes and provides for a mere Confederacy of the States, and not a Government of the People of the United States. That "the people of the United States" should have a Supreme National Government, without the power and the obligation of protecting all the inhabitants of the United States, is a theory quite too monstrous to be believed.

Messrs. Lincoln and Everett, we repeat it, have done a notable week's work.

BROOKLYN, 7 July, 1861.

REV. WILLIAM GOODSELL,

Dear Sir:—Rev. Jos. P. Thompson has called my attention to a passage in your paper, *The Principia*, of June 29th, beginning, "When Lewis Tappan was persecuted in the Broadway Tabernacle Church."

You had forgotten, when you wrote that paragraph, that the Broadway church, at the time, was a Presbyterian church, and that the "Broadway Tabernacle Church," as now existing under the pastoral charge of Mr. Thompson, was formed nearly two years after the persecution to which you allude. Mr. Hale, as you remark, defended the right of the individual concerned, both being members of the Presbyterian church at the time; and Mr. Thompson, his biographer, in his Memoir of Mr. Hale, applauded his course.

The pastor of the Broadway Church, at the time of the persecution, Rev. Joel Parker, was a Presbyterian, and he continues so to this day. I do not see how any body of Congregationalists as such, could visit him with censure for what he did as a Presbyterian, however justly they might censure him as a minister and a man.

I feel persuaded that you will be glad to make a correction as your statement affects a Christian Church, and the truth of history.

Very truly your friend and brother,

LEWIS TAPPAN.

P. S. On page 675, 1st column, you allude to the Fulton Street prayer meeting. The meetings are now open to remarks and prayers respecting slavery.

REMARKS. We are glad to make these corrections. We had indeed overlooked the change in the ecclesiastical relations of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, and were not aware in the change of organization, "two years afterward." The readers of our Review, we think, will have seen that our statement involved no censure of Rev. Dr. Thompson, "the present pastor," in that matter, as we distinguished him from the "pastor who led on the persecution." So far as denominational church polity is concerned, we admit that Presbyterianism, not Congregationalism is responsible for those proceedings. Whether the present church should be considered identical, as a local church, with the one whose name it continues to bear, we will not undertake to determine. A great change of members has doubtless taken place. We hope that the present church will take care that they do not copy the example of their predecessors, in this matter, by enlisting in similar persecutions, on a larger scale, and thus "allow the deeds of their" predecessors. [Luke xi, 48]

We are also glad to learn that Dr. Thompson approved the labors of David Hale, in vindicating a persecuted abolitionist. We shall hope, ultimately, to receive his approbation also, for vindicating large numbers of abolitionists, under still more aggravated persecutions, from a more widely extended and more numerous band of persecutors, operating in the use of more extraordinary methods.

We are truly rejoiced to learn, for the first time, that "the Fulton Street prayer meetings are now open to remarks and prayers respecting slavery." This is worth publishing through all Christendom. The world moves, and the Church moves with it, instead of moving the world, as it should have done.

the first blow struck in defence of National Sovereignty, as against State Sovereignty, was a blow struck at the hitherto unassailed grand fortress of slavery. Carry that fortress, and the "peculiar institution" is left, defenceless, to be disposed of, as the hearts and consciences of Christian freemen shall dictate. For, who does not know that every appeal to humanity, morality, religion, and love of liberty, for thirty years past, has been parried by the counter claims of "State Sovereignty," "State rights" and lack of National supremacy over State supremacy?

The slavery issue has, in this respect, been made an exception to all other issues. Every where else, the National Supremacy, as before stated, has been made to control State Supremacy. On the slavery question, alone, the theory has been reversed. Thanks to the Slaveholder's direct assault on the National Supremacy, the National existence, that exception, we trust, is in process of being swept away, forever.

Just here it is, if we mistake not, that the cause of abolition has most to hope, from the present struggle. If the Federal Government is to be sustained, the theory of Federal Supremacy is to be sustained. The theory of State Supremacy is to be swept away, and that, too, in a contest wherein, as the slaveholders themselves attest, the slavery issue presented the main question.

We have anxiously watched to see what course our intelligent statesmen would take, on so vital an issue. Would they attempt to dodge the great question between National and State Supremacy? To do so would be to dodge the main question between the Confederate States, so called, and the United States.

To vindicate it, hesitatingly, feebly, sophistically, would be more fatal to the Government than the fall of Fort Sumpter, Fortress Monroe, and every other Fortress on our coast. It would, in fact, involve the ultimate loss of them all. For armies and navies are composed of men. Revenues are furnished or are withheld by men. And men, especially in civilized communities, most of all in Republics, are controlled by ideas. And the ideas of a people are shaped by their leading men, their thinkers, their writers, their orators, their members of Congress, their Senators, their Presidents. A President's Message, at a time like this, to be what it should be, is of more importance than ten ordinary battles. It has battles, and it should have victories, wrapped up in it.

The past week, bare of military events, has brought us two battles, logical battles, of more importance to the war, than any four battles that have yet been fought, during the contest.

We allude to the President's Message and the Oration of Edward Everett, on the 4th of July, in the New-York Academy of Music, as published in the New-York Evening Post, of July 5. The oration is admitted to be the crowning effort of his oratorical powers. Apart from its wrong views of the direct slavery question, of which we need say nothing, here, it is indeed, a masterly effort. Like the President's Message, it triumphantly defends National Supremacy and cuts up State Supremacy by the roots. This was all the service to be expected from either of them, on those occasions, and this service they have effectually rendered.

The portion of the Message to which we allude we have recorded in our columns. Of the slavery question, direct, the President has said nothing new. We could wish he had said nothing at all. 'As it is, he had but briefly referred to his Inaugural for his ultimate intentions. We let that pass. But on the question of National Supremacy, as against State Supremacy, he has done nobly. He has evidently studied his subject, and writes with racy originality of manner. Like other truly able writers, he avails himself, as he should do, of the labors of others. We mistake if he has not availed himself of the writings of radical abolitionists. He notices, as John Quincy Adams had done, that the Declaration of Independence knows no sovereign States outside of the United States. He notices, what no other statesman or writer, except Radical abolitionists, so far as we know, had before noticed, in the discussion of this subject, that there were United Colonies, before there were United States, and in order to the existence of States; that there were no States nor State rights that did not grow out of a previous Union. From facts like these, the common

As most of our readers will have seen the document, in other papers, we record only a few further

EXTRACTS FROM THE MESSAGE.

Including those in which the President presents his arguments against the theory of secession, which we think well worth preserving.

It might seem at first thought to be of little difference whether the present movement at the South be called secession or rebellion. The movers, however, well understand the difference.

At the beginning, they knew that they could never raise their treason to any respectable magnitude, by any name which implies violation of law; they knew their people possessed as much moral sense, as much of devotion to law and order, and as much reverence for the history and government of their common country, as any other civilized and patriotic people. They knew they could make no advancement directly in the teeth of these strong and noble sentiments. Accordingly, they commenced by an insidious debauchery of the public mind; they invented ingenious sophisms, which, if conceded, was followed by perfectly logical steps through all the incidents of the complete destruction of the Union. The sophism itself is, that any State of the Union may, consistently with the nation's Constitution, and, therefore, lawfully and peacefully withdraw from the Union, without the consent of the Union, or of any other State.

The little disguise that the supposed right is to be exercised only for just cause, themselves to be the sole judge of its justice, is too thin to merit any notice. With rebellion thus sugar coated, they have been drugging the people of their section, for more than thirty years, and until at length they have brought many good men to take up arms against the government, the day after some assembling of men have enacted the farcical pretense of taking their State out of the Union, who could have been brought to no such thing the day before.

This sophism derives much, perhaps the whole of its currency, from the assumption that there is some omnipotent and sacred supremacy pertaining to a State—to each State of our Federal Union. Our States have neither more nor less power than that reserved to them in the Union by the Constitution, no one of them ever having been a State out of the Union. The original ones passed into the Union, even before they cast off their British Colonial dependence, and the new ones came into the Union directly from a condition of dependence, excepting Texas; and even Texas, in its temporary independence, was never designated as a State.

The new ones only took the designation of States on coming into the Union, while that name was first adopted for old ones in and by the Declaration of Independence. Therein the united colonies were declared to be free and independent States. But even then, the object plainly was not to declare their independence of one another of the Union, but directly the contrary, as their mutual pledge and their mutual action before, at the time, and afterward, abundantly show. The express plighting of faith by each and all of the original thirteen States, in the articles of confederation two years later, that the Union shall be perpetual, is most conclusive, having never been States either in substance or in name, outside of the Union. Whence this magical omnipotence of State Rights, asserting a claim of power to lawfully destroy the Union itself? Much is said about the sovereignty of the States, but the word even is not in the National Constitution, nor, as is believed, in any of the State Constitutions.

What is a sovereignty in the political sense of the term? Would it be far wrong to define it a political community, without a political superior? Tested by this, no one of our States, except Texas, was a sovereignty, and even Texas gave up the character on coming into the Union, by which act she acknowledged the Constitution of the United States and the laws and treaties of the United States, made in pursuance of States, have their status in the Union made in pursuance of the Constitution, to be for her the supreme law. The States have their status in the Union, and they have no other legal status. If they break from this they can only do so against law, and by revolution.

The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence and liberty by conquest or purchase; the Union gave each of them whatever of liberty and independence it has. The Union is older than any of the States, and in fact it created them as States. Originally some dependent colonies made the Union, and in turn the Union threw off their old dependence for them and made them States, such as they are. Not one of them ever had a State Constitution independent of the Union. Of course it is not forgotten that all the new States formed their Constitutions before they entered the Union, nevertheless dependent upon and preparatory to coming into the Union. Unquestionably the States have the powers and rights reserved to them in and by the National Constitution, but among these surely are not included all conceivable powers, however mischievous or destructive, but at most such only as were known in the world at the time as governmental powers; and certainly a power to destroy the government itself had never been known as a governmental. As a mere administrative power, this relative matter of national power and State Rights, as a principle,

is no other than the principle of generality and locality. Whatever concerns the whole should be confined to the whole general government, while whatever concerns only the State should be left exclusively to the State.

This is all there is of original principle about it. Whether the National Constitution, in defining boundaries between the two has applied the principle with exact accuracy, is not to be questioned. We are all bound by that defining without question. What is now combatted is the position that Secession is consistent with the Constitution,—is lawful and peaceful. It is not contended that there is any express law for it, and nothing should ever be implied as law which leads to unjust or absurd consequences. The nation purchased with money the countries out of which several of these States were formed. Is it just that they should go off without leave, and without refunding? The nation paid very large sums in the aggregate—I believe nearly a hundred millions—to relieve Florida of the aboriginal tribes.

Is it just that she shall now be off without consent or without any return? The nation is now in debt for money applied to the benefit of these so-called seceding States, in common with the rest. Is it just either that creditors shall go unpaid, or the remaining States pay the whole? A part of the present national debt was contracted to pay the old debts of Texas. Is it just that she shall leave and pay no part of this herself? Again, if one State may secede, so may another; and when all shall have seceded, none is left to pay the debts. Is this quite just to creditors? Did we notify them of this sage view of ours when we borrowed their money? If we now recognize this doctrine by allowing the seceders to go in peace, it is difficult to see what we can do if others choose to go, or to extort terms upon which they will promise to remain.

The seceders insist that our Constitution admits of secession. They have assumed to make a National Constitution of their own, in which, of necessity, they have either discarded or retained the right of secession, as they insist it exists in ours. If they have discarded it, they thereby admit that, on principle, it ought not to exist in ours; if they have retained it, by their own construction of ours, they show that, to be consistent, they must secede from one another whenever they shall find it the easiest way of settling their debts, or effecting any other selfish or unjust object.

The principle itself is one of disintegration, and upon which no government can endure. If all the States save one, should assert the power to drive that one out of the Union, it is presumed the whole class of seceder politicians would at once deny the power, and denounce the act as the greatest outrage upon State Rights. But suppose that precisely the same act, instead of being called driving the one out, should be called the seceding of the others from that one, it would be exactly what the seceders claim to do, unless indeed they make the point that the one, because it is a minority, may rightfully do what the others, because they are a majority, may not rightfully do.

These politicians are subtle and profound in the rights of minorities. They are not partial to that power which made the Constitution, and speaks from the preamble, calling itself "We the people." It may well be questioned whether there is to-day, a majority of the legally qualified voters of any State, except, perhaps, South Carolina, in favor of disunion. There is much reason to believe that the Union men are the majority in many, if not in every other one of the so-called seceded States.

The contrary has not been demonstrated in any one of them. It is ventured to affirm this even of Virginia and Tennessee, for the result of an election held in military camps, where the bayonets are all on one side of the question voted upon, can scarcely be considered as demonstrating popular sentiment. At such an election all that large class who are at once for the Union and against coercion, would be coerced to vote against the Union. It may be affirmed without extravagance, that the free institutions we enjoy have developed the powers and improved the condition of our whole people beyond any example in the world. Of this, we now have a striking and impressive illustration.

So large an army as the government now has on foot was never before known, without a soldier in it but who has taken his place there of his own free choice. But more than this, there are many single regiments, whose members, one and another, possess full practical knowledge of all the arts, sciences, professions, and whatever else, whether useful or elegant, is known in the whole world; and there is scarcely one from which there could not be selected a President, a Cabinet, a Congress, and perhaps a Court, abundantly competent to administer the government itself. Nor do I say this is not true also in the army of our late friends, now adversaries, in this contest. But it is so much better the reason why the government which has conferred benefits on both them and us should not be broken up. Whoever in any section, proposes to abandon such a government, would do well to consider in deference to what principle it is that he does it; what better he is likely to get in its stead; whether the substitute will give, or be intended to give, so much of good to the people.

There are some foreshadowings on this subject. Our adversaries have adopted some declarations of independence, in which, unlike the good old one penned by Jefferson, they omit the words "all men are created equal." Why? They have adopted a temporary National Constitution in the preamble of which, unlike our good old one signed by

Washington, they omit "we the people," and substitute, "we the Deputies of the Sovereign and Independent States." Why?

Why this deliberate pressing out of view the rights of men and the authority of the people? This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men, to lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all, to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life, yielding to partial and temporary departures from necessity.

This is the leading object of the Government, for whose existence we contend. I am most happy to believe that the plain people understand and appreciate this. It is worthy of note that, while in this, the Government's hour of trial, large numbers of those in the army and navy who have been favored with offices have resigned, and proved false to the hand which pampered them, not one common soldier or common sailor is known to have deserted his flag. Great honor is due to those officers who remained true, despite the example of their treacherous associates; but the greatest honor, and the most important fact of all is the unanimous firmness of the common soldiers and common sailors.

To the last man, so far as known, they have successfully resisted the traitorous efforts of those whose commands, but an hour before, they obeyed as absolute law. This is the patriotic instinct of plain people. They understand without an argument that the destroying the Government which was made by Washington means no good to them. Our popular Government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it our people have settled, the successful establishing and the successful administering of it. One still remains. Its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. It is now for them to demonstrate to the world that those who can fairly carry an election can also suppress a rebellion; that ballots are the rightful and peaceful successors of bullets, and that when ballots have fairly and constitutionally decided, there can be no successful appeal back to bullets, that there can be no successful appeal except to ballots themselves, at succeeding elections. Such will be a great lesson of peace, teaching men that what they cannot take by an election, neither can they take it by a war. Teaching all the folly of being the beginners of a war.

Let there be some uneasiness in the minds of candid men as to what is to be the course of the Government toward the Southern States after the rebellion shall have been suppressed, the Executive deems it proper to say it will be his purpose then, as ever, to be guided by the Constitution and the laws, and that he probably will have no different understanding of the powers and duties of the Federal Government relatively to the rights of the States and the people under the Constitution, than that expressed in the Inaugural Address. He desires to preserve the Government, that it may be administered for all as it was administered by the men who made it.

Loyal citizens everywhere have the right to claim this of their Government, and the Government has no right to withhold or neglect it. It is not perceived that in giving it there is any coercion, any conquest, or any subjugation in any just sense of these terms.

The Constitution provided and all the States have accepted the provision that the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government; but if a State may lawfully go out of the Union, having done so it may also discard the Republican form of government, so that to prevent its going out is an indispensable means to the end of maintaining the guaranty mentioned, and when an end is lawful and obligatory, the indispensable means to it are also lawful and obligatory.

SATURDAY, July 6

Gen. Patterson, now that he has commenced active operations, seems indisposed to lose through inaction any advantage he may have gained. He has pursued the victory he achieved over the rebel forces on the 2d, and on the 4th the enemy was driven from Martinsburgh, and pursued for some distance beyond. This intelligence was received in Washington on the evening of the 4th. The mass of the people of Martinsburgh, it is stated, welcomed the National troops with enthusiasm, gratified that the protection of the Government was at last to be afforded them. It is understood that the rebel loss in the battle on the 2d, was sixty killed and many wounded.—Times.

Destructive Conflagration.—Boston, Thursday, July 4, 1861. Shortly after noon to-day, a fire broke out in East Boston, near the ship-yards, consuming Nickerson's wharves and salt warehouses, the Suffolk Salt Mills, the East Boston Iron Foundry and Machine Shop, the Sectional Dock and Marine Railways, nearly one hundred dwelling houses, marine and mechanical warehouses, as well as an immense amount of lumber, timber, marine stores, and patterns of all descriptions, including moulds for the new gunboat contracted for by Paul Curtis.—Tribune.

MONDAY, July 8

Western Virginia.—Another skirmish has occurred in Western Virginia, the results of which are represented to be quite important. Gov. Wise, with a body guard of fifty

men under native Union are reported ally wounded skirmish of needs conf Vallandi Ohio regim coived with forced to lo and on ta other mi From Jasper co and report It was re leading U caping fug commists Montgoe ing of the World Maryland party arriv afternoon t Four ke secreted in arms were The Stee is said, cha tomac, at t and two ot low and h of the boat low will h is not to be ington had ed.] Marine Vast im of telegraph upon the su We are the Atlanti The late J London wa are as high The Hou the questio extra se-sio to introduce to 52 says. Geo. Hic represents ing, and is Union men The East land. To abolition of out a perpe needed. W cheapest th not? Congress following re 1. Res-J part of the ture or retu 2. Resolv structed to commonly 3. Where signed his with rebelli Resolved and unjusti ple demand On moti the table, b Among c by Mr. Lo Committee property o government A flag of Taylor, wa is side, yes escorted to was ascert President I dent summi held during

THE PHANTOM.

BY HAYARD TAYLOR.

[To appreciate the delicate and touching points of this poem, it must be borne in mind that the Poet in early life, like most others who commune with the muses, became a fond lover. The fair object of his devotion was in feeble health, and the nuptial day, on that account, had been deferred from time to time, till at last, it became evident that she must yield to the destroyer. A few days before her decease, she became the wife of Hayard Taylor. After that sad event, the distracted widower became a traveller, and after roaming around the world for some years, he came back and poured out his whole soul in these lines.]

Again I sit within the mansion,
In the old familiar seat;
And shade and sunshine chase each other
O'er the carpet at my feet.

But the sweet-brier's arms have wrestled upwards,
In the summers that are past,
And the willow trails its branches lower
Than when I saw them last;

They strive to shut the sunshine wholly
From out the haunted room;
To fill the house, that once was joyful,
With silence and with gloom.

And many kind remembered faces
Within the doorway come—
Voices that wake the sweeter music
Of one that now is dumb.

They sing, in tones as glad as ever,
The songs she loved to hear;
They braid the rose in summer garlands,
Whose flowers to her were dear.

And still, her footsteps in the passage,
Her blushes at the door,
Her timid words of maiden welcome,
Come back to me once more.

And, all forgetful of my sorrow,
Unmindful of my pain,
I think she has but newly left me,
And soon will come again.

She stays without, perhaps, a moment,
To dress her dark brown hair;
I hear the rustle of her garments—
Her light step on the stair.

O fluttering heart! control thy tumult,
Lest eyes profane should see
My cheeks betray the rush of rapture
Her coming brings to me!

She tarries long; but lo! a whisper
Beyond the open door,
And gliding through the quiet sunshine
A shadow on the floor.

Ah! 'tis the whispering pine that calls me,
The vine whose shadow strays;
And my patient heart must still await her,
Nor chide her long delays.

But my heart grows sick with weary, waiting,
As many a time before;
Her foot is ever at the threshold
Yet never passes o'er.

WE SLEEP TOO LITTLE.

But if night, and not day, is the time to sleep, then it may be said that the general principle prevails, that the amount of sleep should be regulated by the dividing line between light and darkness; and that this view may be accepted as the correct one, is determined from analogy;—it being true that animals accept it and act upon it in the temperate latitudes, which are supposed to be the most favorable for the development of the human organism in its highest proportions. Take the year together, day and night are about equal; and were mankind, within these latitudes to live according to the laws of life and health in other directions, they would sleep while darkness is on the face of the earth, and be active only during the period in which light was abundant. As a habit and fashion with our people, we sleep too little. It is admitted by all those who are competent to speak on the subject, that the people of the United States from day to day, not only do not get sufficient sleep, but they do not get sufficient rest. By the preponderance of the nervous over the vital temperament, they need all the recuperating benefits which sleep can offer, each night, as it passes. A far better rule would be to get at least eight hours sleep, and, including sleep, ten hours of incumbent rest. It is a sad mistake that some make, who suppose

all this is, of course, impossible to explain, and it is unsafe even to venture an opinion.—*Id.*

WEDNESDAY, 10th.

The Truce a Ruse.—Washington July 9.—The Star has an extra, saying: "Colonel Taylor, who came hither under a flag of truce yesterday, says that his business was disposed of at the White House in a very few moments, for in that time he was sent back to Gen. Scott with one letter less than he bore on his person on entering the United States lines, the President not deeming the communication he brought such as required him to enter into any communication with Davis."

Col. Taylor was next immediately faced in the direction from which he came, and marched back to Gen. McDowell's headquarters, where, through courtesy, he was kindly treated. He was, however, kept under a strict guard until an early hour this morning, when he was escorted back to the confederate lines and turned loose to find his way back to Beauregard, without having accomplished what was evidently a main point to be attained by his mission, namely, to communicate with the traitors in our midst, who had doubtless prepared to send to Beauregard, through him, important information concerning the alleged contemplated movement of Gen. McDowell's army upon the Confederate lines." The Star further says: "Although the President has communicated the exact contents of the letter from Davis brought by Col. Taylor, to no one besides his (the President's) constitutional advisers and Gen. Scott, yet from certain signs, we are able to assure the public that it amounted to nothing of earthly importance in the present crisis."

Congress. Fugitive Slaves. In the House, yesterday, Mr. LOVEJOY (Rep. Ill.) introduced a resolution that, in the judgment of the House, it is no part of the duty of soldiers of the United States to capture or return fugitive slaves.

Mr. MALLORY (Union, Ky) moved to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. STRATTON (Dem. N. J.) raised the point that the resolution is not admissible under the order adopted yesterday prescribing the business of the session.

The SPEAKER, for reasons given, overruled the point.

Mr. CARLILE, of Virginia, unsuccessfully, sought to submit an amendment to Mr. Lovejoy's resolution.

Mr. STRATTON, without meaning disrespect to the Speaker, appealed from his decision.

Mr. HUTCHINS (Dem. Ohio) moved to lay the appeal on the table, which was agreed to.

The SPEAKER, therefore, was sustained.

Mr. CARLILE, of Virginia, again ineffectually appealed to Mr. Lovejoy to withdraw his demand for the previous question on the passage of his (Lovejoy's) resolution, he (Carlile) desiring to offer an amendment to the same.

The main question was then ordered, and Mr. Lovejoy's resolution was passed by a vote of 92 against 55.

'So far, so good.' The Resolution is not an enactment, nor would it be if concurred in by the Senate. But it will have influence.

THURSDAY 11th.

The loan bill was yesterday taken up in the House of Representatives, and passed by a vote of 149 Yeas to 5 Nays. The Nays were as follows: Messrs. Burnett, Reid, Norton, Vallandigham, and Ben Wood.

The Army bill was passed, appropriating 287 500 000 for various purposes specified. The Navy Bill appropriates, 30,000 000 more.

Battle in Missouri. At Carthage, Missouri, Col. Seigel, with 1,500 Federal troops, met Gov. Jackson, with a much larger rebel force, (some accounts say 10,000). After a sharp conflict, both armies seem to have retreated, and 85 horses and a quantity of arms were carried off by Col. Seigel. Of the loss of lives, on each side, the accounts are very conflicting.

Family Miscellany.

GATHERING FLOWERS.

Gather the flower that hidden lies,
Deep in the dew like a transient gem;
Gather the buds that stately rise,
Two of a color, and three on a stem.
"Yes," said my child, "I'll gather them well;
For which is the sweetest I cannot tell."

Gather the flowers that speak of hope—
Scenting the breath of the morning hour;
Gather the buds that only ope
When night comes apace, or the tempests lower.
"Yes," said my sweet one, "for both are bright;
One's for morning, the other for night."

"And is it not strange," she gently said,
As she laid down beside me the spoils that were ours,
That since I loved Jesus, so oft I've been led
To thank him for summer, and sunshine, and flowers?
It seems as if now I'm but learning to look
On the woods and the fields, as a leaf of God's book."

—W. S., in the Dial.

men under Captain Patton, was fired upon by a company of native Union men near Sissionville, and forty of the guard were reported to have been killed, and Wise and Patton mortally wounded. There appears to be no doubt that such a skirmish occurred, but the report relative to Gov. Wise needs confirmation.—*Times.*

Vallandigham, the recreant Ohio Congressman, visited the Ohio regiments across the Potomac yesterday, and was received with such decided marks of disfavor, that he was forced to leave, for fear of violence. He was hung in effigy, and on taking his departure was pelted with onions and other missiles.—*Times.*

From Kansas.—Leavenworth, July 6.—Fugitives from Jasper county (Missouri), are hourly arriving at Fort Scott, and report a terrible state of affairs in that section.

It was reported that Dr. Wilson, Dr. Selman, and other leading Union men had been hung. In some cases the escaping fugitives had been followed into Kansas by the secessionists.

Montgomery, with 400 men entered Missouri on the morning of the 27th ult., but his object has not yet transpired.—*World.*

Maryland.—Baltimore, July 6.—Secretary Cameron and party arrived here this morning from Old Point, to take the afternoon train for Washington.

Four kegs and two boxes filled with powder were found secreted in the western police station. A small number of arms were also found.—*Id.*

The Steamer Cataline, recently destroyed by fire, was, it is said, chartered to the Government for service on the Potomac, at the rate of \$10,000 a month, by Thurlow Weed and two other parties. If this statement be correct, Thurlow and his associates had "a big job"—the whole value of the boat being less than two months charter price. Thurlow will have to make another explanation. Of course, it is not to be supposed that his "particular friend" in Washington had any interest in the contract.—*Sun.* [Contradicted].

Marine Telegraphs. A Letter from England says—

"Vast improvements in everything relating to the structure of telegraph cables are constantly being made, and inquiry upon the subject is very active.

We are becoming much more hopeful of a good time for the Atlantic Company.—*Sun.*

The late fire in London. The loss by the conflagration in London was over two millions sterling. Some of the estimates are as high as three or four millions. Nearly all insured.—*Id.*

The House of Representatives has just taken a test vote on the question of prohibiting all ordinary legislation during the extra session, especially with a view of cutting off all attempts to introduce compromise measures. The vote stood 102 yeas to 52 nays. So the compromisers are at a discount.—*Post.*

TUESDAY 10th.

Gov. Hicks, of Maryland, was in Washington to-day. He represents that on the eastern shore there is much rebel feeling, and is anxious that a force should be sent down to afford Union men protection.—*Times.*

The Eastern shore is the strong hold of slavery in Maryland. "To afford Union men protection" there, requires the abolition of the slaveholding oligarchy. Nothing else, (with out a perpetual standing army) will suffice. Nothing more is needed. Will the Government afford the protection in the cheapest the only sure and permanent method? If not, why not?

Congress. In the House, yesterday, Mr. Lovejoy offered the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That in the judgment of this House it is no part of the duty of the soldiers of the United States to capture or return fugitive slaves.

2. Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire into the expediency of repealing the law commonly called the Fugitive Slave law.

3. Whereas, Major Emory, of the United States Army, resigned his commission under circumstances showing sympathy with rebellion against the Government; therefore,

Resolved, That his restoration to the service was improper and unjustifiable, and that this House in the name of the people demand of the Executive his immediate removal.

On motion of Mr. Edwards, the Resolutions were laid on the table, by 87 votes against 62.

Among other important motions adopted, was one made by Mr. Loomis of Connecticut, instructing the Judiciary Committee to prepare and report a bill to confiscate the property of all office-holders found in arms against the government.—*Times.*

A flag of truce from the rebels, borne by Col. Thomas Taylor, was brought into Col. Tyler's camp, on the Virginia side, yesterday afternoon. Col. Taylor was immediately escorted to the headquarters of Gen. McDowell, when it was ascertained that he was the bearer of dispatches for President Lincoln. On receipt of the dispatches the President summoned his Cabinet at once, and consultations were held during the evening with Gen. Scott. The meaning of

themselves qualified to speak on the subject, in affirming that persons of a highly-wrought, nervous temperament, need—as compared with those of a more lymphatic, or stolid organization—less sleep. The truth is, that where power is expended with great rapidity, by a constitutional law, it is re-gathered slowly;—the reaction after a while demanding much more time for the gathering up of new force, than the direct effort demands in expending that force. Thus a man of the nervous temperament, after he has established a habit of overdoing, recovers from the effect of such over-action, much more slowly than a man of different temperament would, if the balance between his power to do and his power to rest, is destroyed. As between the nervous and the lymphatic temperaments, therefore, where excess of work is demanded, it will always be seen that at the close of the day's labor, whether it has been of muscle or thought, the man of nervous temperament, who is tired, finds it difficult to fall to sleep, sleeps perturbedly, wakes up excitedly, and is more apt than otherwise to resort to stimulants to place himself in conditions of pleasurable activity. While the man of lymphatic temperament, when tired, falls asleep, sleeps soundly and uninterruptedly, and wakes up in the morning a new man. The facts are against the theory that nervous temperaments recuperate quickly from the fatigues to which their possessors are subjected. Three fourths of our drunkards are from the ranks of the men of nervous temperament. Almost all opium-eaters in our country—and their name is Legion—are persons of the nervous, or nervous sanguine temperaments. Almost all the men in the country who become the victims of narcotic drug-medication, are of the nervous or nervous-sanguine temperament. That the very general habit of dependence upon stimulants, or stimulo-narcotics, is almost entirely confined to persons of the nervous temperaments, shows that the taxations to which they subject themselves, are not readily reacted from; and that under their methods of living, they find it difficult to depend upon the natural force to make good their losses within the time they allot for that purpose. The rule, therefore, should be the other way from that which it is supposed to be—namely, that persons of highly wrought nervous organization need but little sleep. It should be the habit with such persons to sleep largely, and to insist upon such freedom from exercise, both of body and mind, and such external conditions of repose, as gradually to bring the brain to acknowledge such relations to the general structure, as will enable its various organs to become so refreshed, that they may, when duty is resumed, perform it with accustomed yet healthy vigor.—*Dr. J. C. Jackson.*

ALL RIGHT; OR, TRUE OBEDIENCE.

"Aunt Mary, may I go up on the top of the house and fly my kite?" asked Henry Alford one day. Henry was a visitor in the city and almost a stranger to his aunt. He saw the little boys on the tops of the neighboring houses flying their kites with great success, and the thought struck him that he would have special fun if he could do the same. His aunt of course wished to gratify the boy in all reasonable enjoyment, but deemed this particular feat very unsafe; and though she did not know how it might affect Henry, she felt that she must refuse his request.

"I don't want you to go, Henry," said she; "I consider that a very dangerous thing for a little boy like you to attempt."

"All right, then, I'll go out on the bridge," replied Henry.

His aunt smiled. "I hope you'll always be as acquiescent, my lad," said she to herself.

"Henry, what are you doing?" called his mother on another occasion.

"Spinning my new top, mother."

"Can't you take the baby out to ride? Get out the carriage, and I'll bring him down."

"All right," shouted the boy, as he put his top in his pocket, and hastened to fulfil his mother's request.

"Aunt Mary, may I go that errand for you? I know I can find the place, and I like to find my way round the city so much."

"Well, you go straight down P street to F, and then cross that, and a little further down is J street. Go into that, and about three blocks down—oh no, Henry, it's of no use; there are so many crooks and turns in the way you

never can find it. Wait until Robert comes home and you shall go with him."

"All right," was the cheerful reply.

"Uncle William, may I go over to your store this morning? I want to see those baskets again I was looking at yesterday."

"Oh yes, Henry, I shall be very glad to have you."

"But I can't spare you to-day, Henry," said his mother. "I want you to go out with me; you shall go to the store another time."

"All right," responded the child.

No matter what request was made of Henry, what wish of his was refused, what disappointment or task it was necessary to impose upon him—his uniform answer was, "All right." Not a word of expostulation or teasing was uttered—no "why can't I," or "must I," or "do let me," or "I don't want to," was ever heard from his lips. His aunt thought he was a model for all boys.

"This is obedience that is worth something," said she, "prompt, cheerful, uniform, and unquestioning. Pity all boys and girls were not like Henry. What a comfort they would be to their parents—ay, and to themselves too. What a deal of vexation, trouble, and sorrow they might save."

And I thought what a pity God's children had not this same spirit of ready, uncompromising submission. To say, "All right" to the appointments of our Heavenly Father, would be indeed pleasing to him. To enter with alacrity upon every duty, to receive uncomplainingly each needed infliction, to hear without murmuring the numerous disappointments of life, to be satisfied with any arrangement. Infinite Wisdom may see fit to make for us—ah, this indeed would honor God, and be fruitful of improvement, peace, and happiness to ourselves. So would our whole lives be an utterance of that sentiment which multitudes deem so hard, "Not my will, but thine be done;" and the "peace of God which passeth all understanding" would flow like a deep quiet river through the soul.—*Independent.*

H. E. E.

OPPOSITES IN RELIGION.

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching."—*Paul.*

"I believe I'll stay at home to-day, as it is rainy and I don't like to go and spend my time listening to Bro. W., for he can't preach much, anyhow."—*Fair Weather Laziness.*

"Pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you."—*Paul.*

"I can't find time to pray, and then I have so many things to attend to, and my mind is so taken up with the business of the day that I am not prepared to pray."—*Worldly mind-edness.*

"See that none render evil for evil unto any man, but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves and toward all men."—*Paul.*

"My neighbor has done me so much evil and has acted so badly that I will not stand it any longer; I'll make him know that I have rights, as other men, and I'll make him respect them."—*Revenge.*

"Strive to enter in at the straight gate."—*Christ.*

"All will be made holy and happy, and there is no danger."—*Presumption.*

"Contend earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints."—*Jude.*

"Don't preach doctrinal sermons, or you will offend some people."—*Faint-heartedness.*

"Withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."—*Paul.*

"If ye withdraw from Brother B., he will do us all the injury he can, and I think we had better let him alone."—*Trimmer.*

"Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness."—*Christ.*

"As soon as you get settled in life it will be easy for you to serve God, but you cannot well do it before."—*Satan.*

"They that preach the gospel should live of the gospel."—*Paul.*

"I think that they should preach for nothing, or at least should follow some other business for their living."—*Covetousness.*

BEAUTIFUL IDEA.

In the mountains of Tyrol, it is the custom of the women and children to come out when it is bed-time and sing their national songs until they hear their husbands, fathers and brothers answer them from the hills on their return home. On the shores of the Adriatic such a custom prevails. There the wives of the fishermen come about sunset and sing a melody. After singing the first stanza, they listen awhile for an answering melody from off the water; and continue to sing and listen till the well-known voice comes borne on the waters, telling that the loved one is almost home. How sweet to the weary fisherman, as the shadows gather around him, must be the songs of the loved ones at home, that sing to cheer him; and how they must strengthen and tighten the links that bind together those humble dwellers by the sea.

THOMAS JEFFERSON ON INSURRECTIONS.—"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and that his vengeance will not sleep forever. The Almighty has no attribute which will take sides with us [slaveholders] in such a contest."

There is a certain charm about great superiority of intellect, that winds into deep affections. Genius makes many enemies, but it makes sure friends—friends who forgive much, who endure long, who exact little; they partake of the character of disciples as well as friends. There lingers about the human heart a strong inclination to look upward—to revere; in this inclination lies the source of religion, of loyalty; and also of worship and immortality which are rendered so cheerfully to the great of old.

Knowledge is a tree. We must plant it when we are young, if we would enjoy its fruit and shadow when we grow old. It requires a life-long growth to reach its full maturity and its richest fruits. Besides, the germ flourishes best and grows fastest in the virgin soil of the young mind.

BUXTON'S DAILY LIFE.—An intimate friend of Thomas Fowell Buxton says of him: "He walked through the world like a man passing through the wards of a hospital, and stooping down, on all sides, to administer help where it was needed."

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: FOR CASH ONLY.
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50. Postage 25 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 25 cts.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 50. Postage 15 cts.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS, INCLUDING

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
 - II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
 - III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
 - IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.
- With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also a summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary leaders, &c.

PRICES OF "Our National Charters."		Delivered at the Office; or sent by private conveyance, or express, as ordered, at the expense of the purchaser.	
By mail, postage prepaid, by the Publisher.		Single copy	12 cents.
For 4 copies	50 "	For 4 copies	35 "
9 "	1.00	9 "	75 "
12 "	1.30	12 "	1.00
20 "	2.00	20 "	1.50
31 "	3.00	31 "	2.00
In packages of more than 20 or 30 copies it is generally cheaper to send by Express, (where it can be done) than by Mail. But this may depend on the distance and directness of the route, and may be ascertained by experiment, or by inquiry at the nearest Express depot.		46 "	3.00
		100 "	6.00

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders, as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publications.

Also, for sale as above, Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

In paper covers, price 75 cents, postage 13 cts.; in cloth, \$1.00, postage 19 cts.

We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 104 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.